

computer and that allows user interaction with a web page. A web page is displayed in a browser on the client computer in response to communications with a server computer. As a user of the browser performs user input actions with the web page, the Viewer program 114 modifies the contents of the displayed web page accordingly. For example, if a user activates a scroll button to scroll through a document that is partially displayed on the web page, the Viewer program changes the text displayed on the web page to reflect the selected scrolling action.

The Page Builder program performs the same tasks as the Viewer program, but the Page Builder program executes from a server computer. The Page Builder program performs these tasks by creating multiple HTML web page files that represent all possible visual states of the web page displayed on the browser. The Page Builder program also incorporates, within the multiple HTML web pages, a set of transaction actions between the visual representations. For example, a document that can only be partially displayed on the web page on the browser will result in multiple HTML files showing all the different states of scrolling through the document, with Hypertext links linking the different HTML files, so that, if the user attempts to scroll through the document, a Hypertext link is activated which downloads to the browser the appropriate HTML file to display the new text that is scrolled into the display area on the browser.

Kiyono discloses a multimedia editing method. The method specifies the multimedia representation of content by means of a template, which provides a logic structure, a layout structure and physical operations. An editing apparatus displays the multimedia content by applying the logic structure, the layout structure and the physical operations to some material information.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is quite different from both Krishna and Kiyono. One nonobvious distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention is that the claimed invention invokes run-time handlers or run-time services. Both Krishna and Kiyono relate to displaying content at a client, and make no reference to invoking run-time handlers or services. There is no suggestion in either of these prior art references that run-time handlers or services should be invoked. Claim 1 has a limitation of “invoking specific functionality for the particular client by invoking corresponding run-time handlers for said determined references.” Similarly, claim 26 has a limitation of “a back-end database providing

client access to information, in response to client invocation of run-time services.” Neither Krishna nor Kiyono disclose or suggest the invoking of run-time handlers or services. Regarding the limitation of claim 1, the Examiner refers to the text in Krishna indicating that operations may be performed at the time that a user . . . requests access to the template 112 file . . . at scheduled intervals; col. 5, lines 25-50. The operations referred to by the Examiner relate to creating HTML pages from a template. Applicant respectfully submits that these operations have nothing to do with invoking run-time handlers. Regarding the limitation of claim 26, the Examiner refers to the text in Krishna indicating that the server 102 then downloads the template file 112 to the browser 132 . . . the Viewer program 114 is also downloaded to the client computer 130; col. 5, lines 16-30. Applicant respectfully submits that downloading the template and Viewer program having nothing to do with invoking run-time services.

Both claims 1 and 26 are also limited to invoking run-time handlers or services for a particular or given client. Claim 1 is limited to “invoking specific functionality for the particular client by invoking corresponding run-time handlers”, while claim 26 is limited to “determining particular run-time services to be invoked for a given client.” Neither Krishna nor Kiyono disclose or suggest taking any particular action based on a particular or given client. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner did not cite any text in either reference that relates to taking a particular action based on the particular or given client.

Claim 1 is also limited to “registering said references of said at least one template with a dictionary.” Applicant respectfully submits that neither Krishna nor Kiyono disclose a dictionary, as that term is used in this application. Regarding this limitation, the Examiner refers to text in Kiyono that indicates that the logic structure in the template is synthesized with the selected material information by the logic structure synthesizing means; col. 7, lines 37-56. Applicant does not understand how the cited language discloses or suggests implementing a dictionary according to Applicant’s invention. The cited language indicates that the selected material information is displayed to a user according to the logic structure in the template.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 26, the only independent claims in the application, are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner for all of the reasons described above. Claims 2-25 and 27-45 depend from claims 1 and 26, respectively.



Accordingly, these dependent claims contain all of the limitations of the respective dependent claims, and are patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner for the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Re-examination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (831) 461-5535.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2002

Darryl A. Smith
Darryl A. Smith; Reg. No. 37,723
Attorney of Record

Legal Department
Starfish Software, Inc.
1700 Green Hills Road
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
(831) 461-5535 - voice
(831) 461-5900 - fax

SF/0024.00